CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Vol. LXIV PITTSBURGH, PA., MARCH, 1930 No. 3

Bible Reading in the School

> **"All the sense of integrity, honor and service I have in my heart I got from hearing the Bible read by a school teacher in the three years that I was privileged to go to a little old fashioned grammar school. The teacher read the Bible every morning to start the day right."**
>
> **HENRY FORD**

Most of our states, either by law or administrative practice, require or permit the daily reading of the Bible at the opening of the school session. It is a time honored practice that has existed, more or less, since the organization of the public school system.

Of late the enemies of the Christian religion and of the public school system have been inclined to sneer at this practice as useless and perfunctory, and call it "a pedagogic hang-over from the superstitious days of the past."

Against this slush we can easily build a wall of such testimony as this of Mr. Ford's. We might add all that has recently been said in the newspapers of the value of the McGuffey's Readers. They were valuable largely because they gave the Bible its perfectly natural place in the literature of the schoolroom.

We are interested in enabling the reader to get a glimpse of what it means to read the Bible every day in the Public Schools.

There are in the United States about 30,000,000 of school age citizens; that is children from 5 to 17 years of age. Of these about 25,000,000 are enrolled in the public Schools. The average number of school days each year for the American child is 140.

To read the Bible in the Public Schools means that 25,000,000 of America's citizens will receive 140 lessons each year in Christian morality and idealism, for an average of twelve years; millions of these citizens will profit each year by this reading. And in their after-lives will rise up and call the teacher who thus read the Bible effectively, "blessed"; the custom which fostered it, "wise"; the law which authorized it, "statesmanship".

It is rather a matter of indifference as to what version of the Scriptures may be read, or what civic body selects the portions to be read, so that the selections conform to the needs of humanity and civil society; that they are sympathetically selected, honestly taken to the school room, and reverently and effectively read.

This reading should be the universal requirement of the state school laws of America and will be if Protestant Americans come to realize the value of this practice in keeping up the Christian ideals of American life.

SOCIAL ROOM
OF
ONTGOMERY H

Where Rome and America Clash

RECENT newspaper discussion of the encyclical on education, issued last month by Pope Pius XI, generally assumes that this document was issued for Italian consumption rather than for the American people. With this we cannot agree. Mussolini has, it is true, replied to it through the Fascist party, by declaring that "Fascistism is determined to retain control of education in Italy to the end that it may prepare spiritually all of Italy's youth from which the future governing classes must spring." So that's that, as far as Italy is concerned.

A more plausible view is that this encyclical issued at this time was intended to throw the weight of Rome into the fight that the American hierarchy is making against the proposed establishment of a department of education in the Federal government with its head a cabinet member. It is one of Rome's astute moves to meddle with American political life.

Whatever its intent, it is a real treatise on religious education and in many respects a remarkably fine one. There is nothing new in it. It merely reiterates the canon law on the subject of education. So far as it proclaims the ideas and ideals which are common to all branches of Christianity it is sound. So far as its immediate aims, methods and means are concerned it is fallacious and politically and socially vicious. It is the educational philosophy that has produced the educational backwardness of Mexico.

In one of the early paragraphs of the document we are confronted by what seems to be a misuse of the word "supernatural." Speaking of the three units of the Kingdom of God he says "two are natural societies, namely the family and civil society; the third, the church, is supernatural." Protestants naturally use the term "spiritual" in this contrast and the content of meaning put into the term in a latter use might indicate that it is the Pope's meaning. We are not unmindful of the fact that we have here an unauthorized translation so we shall not stress the point. His interchangeable use of the words education and instruction is a bit confusing to say the least.

There is much in this treatise with which we are in most hearty accord. We believe with him that God ordained all three of these governing units of social organization and gave each its place in his kingdom. We certainly say a hearty "Amen" to his quotation of the Lord's words, "All power in heaven and on earth is given unto me and that Jesus is the real moral and spiritual head of all three of the divine institutions." But we can scarcely be expected to agree to the implication that Jesus' words, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations," confers upon the the church a preeminent authority in all moral and spiritual matters, much less do they delegate all of the authority of Jesus to the church.

He is correct in asserting the right of the parent in the educating of his child and the right of the church to educate her members and the right of the state to educate its citizens. But it would make for clearness if the writer could grasp the fundamental idea that these rights are concurrent powers and not exclusive, dominating powers.

He is also right in asserting that "no perfect or even adequate education can exist which is not Christion education." No one we believe will take exception to his declaration that "the state must complete the work of the church and families where it is proved insufficient." We presume that he intends to say that it is the duty of the state in this country to give a complete education to the 100,000,000 people in this country that are outside the membership of the Roman Catholic church. We would also include those nominal Romanists which the church is not reaching with its schools.

The Papal See cannot inveigh more strongly against all monopoly of education by the state than Protestants do. But we make our protest include any sort of a church or family monopoly as well.

We agree with the Vatican in the necessity of consistency in the content of instruction. He declares "schools from which religion is excluded are contrary to the fundamental concepts of education. Where literary, social, domestic and religious education are not in accord, man is unhappy and powerless." There certainly will be little further progress in education or civilization where that condition exists.

The sin of disturbing a child's faith in Christianity by teaching speculations as accepted truth is as heinous in the eyes of Protestants as Romanists. The folly of basing education on the assumption of normality in childhood all will agree to except the devotees of the current materialistic evolution. We heartily agree with his words, "False therefore is any pedagogic naturalism which excludes or decreases the importance of supernatural Christian formation in the education of youth." We wish that the expression "Christian formation" were a little more clear.

We all deplore the "lamentable decline today of family education;" and who would question the necessity of "more vigilance on the part of parents and churches" because of the manifold assaults upon Christian ideals by current literature, pictures and philosophies.

Again we believe emphatically in his doctrine that the Church is the mystic body of Christ" but we make that term include all believers in Christ of whatever race, or branch of the visible church.

But here we shall have to part company with the author of this treatise. It is an entirely unwarranted assumption that because the church is spiritual therefore it has the right to dominate the home or the state in anything. "So shall it not be among you."

These units of the kingdom are immediately responsible to Jesus. The church may utter the prophets word to them but they are free from her disciplinary power. The idea of the "maternity" of the church, a mere figure of speech to indicate spiritual ministry, gives no right to dictate in anything.

The equally unwarranted assumption of infallibility in moral concerns on the part of the Roman Church, no other church claims it, makes a Protestant smile when he recalls the multitude of times when in the past the church has contradicted herself in matters involving morals, has been wrong but never had the grace to acknowledge it.

As to her jurisdiction over the teaching of morals that extends not one inch beyond her voluntary membership. She may possess "originally, admissibly, the whole of moral truth," whatever that may

mean, but being the "pillar and ground" of this truth does not give her any exclusive rights to its use. The Bible is certainly a part of that truth and much of that was given to the civil rulers. Rome's claim to copy-right privileges as to revealed truth are purely imaginary.

As to his opposition to co-education we shall not contend. That is a moot question in many branches of the church. Our personal opinion is that it is as wise in the teen age as below twelve and that in college life it makes for a better humanity. But we grant the fact that it is considerably harder for parents or the church to control the marriage of their children when they are so educated. But we are not convinced that there is any loss to civilization or to the Kingdom of Christ because of this independence. There would be no question of this loss were it not for Rome's intolerance of this matter.

But we emphatically deny that any church has a right to say in a disciplinary way to any parent, "you must not send your child to a neutral or mixed school, that is to say schools indifferently open to Catholics and non-Catholics." There Rome invades the rights of parents as unwarrantably and tyrannically as the state would which should undertake to say you must not send them to a church school. She may teach them that it is wise for religious reasons or expedient, or that it is their duty, but to undertake to compel them, as the Bishop of Massachusetts recently did, is an un-Christian invasion of parental rights.

Here is where steel strikes steel and flint grinds against flint, when the Pope declares "Neither is it admissible for Catholics to attend mixed schools (still worse if obligatory for all) where religious instruction is provided,—and pupils receive their teaching from non-Catholic masters, together with non-Catholic children. The fact alone that religious instruction is imparted is not sufficient for the school to be considered as conforming with the rights of the church and Christian families. For a school to be acceptable it is necessary that the teachers, the curriculum and the books be governed under the maternal direction and vigilance of the church."

It is for American Romanists to say whether they will knuckle down to that, but where are the schools to which about 2,000,000 Catholic children can go, if they do? But the next paragraph in this document brings us to the crux of the whole matter, "Nor shall it be said that it is impossible for the state to be divided into various creeds, to provide for public instruction, except by neutral or mixed schools, since the state ought more reasonably and can also more easily provide schools by giving free rein to the initiative and work of the church and the family by helping them with adequate subsidies. And that this can be done to the satisfaction of families and great benefit for; and public peace and tranquility is shown by nations divided into various religious faiths, where financial help on the part of the state is given to each school desired by families."

There will be many more changes in the succession to the throne of the Vatican City before that is done in the United States. As the New York Times said editorially, "If every church demanded that what would become of our public school system?" And we say "What would become of American solidarity?" Here we predict that there will be a resounding "No" from 90,000,000 of the American people.

Today's Duty in Education

IT is, of course, to support our State school system in a large and generous way. That goes without argument.

It is to develop that system until it educates more perfectly the physically and mentally handicapped; the adult who needs it to become an efficient citizen, those handicapped by foreign language, color, geographical isolation, or economic backwardness. This, the states are not doing today, for lack of knowledge, constructive ideas, leadership and funds.

The proposed Department of Education by its research efforts and co-ordination of all Federal efforts will furnish the knowledge of conditions and how to meet them. It will furnish constructive plans, a unified leadership and suggest the sources from which funds may be obtained.

It would seem that it is the clear duty of every believer in sound education to throw his influence and efforts into the task of securing this long overdue development of our machinery of education.

Especially should those who are interested in developing more perfectly the Bible reading practice and moral instruction side of our system of education. Such an agency would take note of what is already being done: encourage all that is good and lawful, suggest to the states that have become tangled in legal quibbles, obsessions and fallacies, how they could snap out of their muddles, and with no element of domination promote this training of conscience as no single agency could. Imagine the value of a government document, which could be obtained as freely as can one on agriculture, which would set forth plainly: the law of every state as to the reading of the Bible in the schools, the judicial decisions supporting it and the administrative practice. Such a document would clarify the thinking and banish the obsessions which today are hobbling the educational system of the whole nation.

All that America needs to lead us forward in our educational work is exact knowledge, circulated without propaganda motives, in such form that the people will know it to be true and acceptable.

Don't Let in the Camel's Nose

Scotland has just had her lesson on the wisdom of the above proverb. Under some one's astute management, the Parliament of Westminster in 1918 enacted a law which allowed school Boards, in case of over crowding, to assist Roman Catholic Parochial schools in the care of their children.

Recently, in the town of Bonnybridge, the Roman Catholics built a parochial school. There was no overcrowding. In fact the public schools had two or three hundred vacant seats. Having built it they demanded its support under the law. The local school authority refused to take it over. The Romanists went into court and lost their case in the Scottish courts. They appealed it to the Law Lords, who by a bare majority, in a split decision, gave judgment in favor of the Romanists.

The result is, that Bonnybridge taxpayers are saddled with duplicate Schools, which as a writer in the Scot's Observer says, "They need about as much as a cart needs three wheels."

THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Founded in 1867

Devoted to Christian Political and Social Science

Official Organ of

THE NATIONAL REFORM ASS'N,

An organization of Christian citizens founded in 1863

Published Monthly at the Association's Headquarters, 209 Ninth St., Pittsburgh, Pa.

R. H. MARTIN, Editor-in-Chief

WM. PARSONS, Associate Editor

Rates, $1.00 the year, payable in advance, Entered as Second Class Matter, July 30, 1906 at Pittsburgh, Pa. under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

A Publicity Stunt

An open forum to express their opposition to national prohibition is what the "Wet" hearing is before the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives as admitted by the Chairman of this Committee in a prepared statement at the opening of the hearing on February 12th. Chairman Graham arranged for this hearing without consulting the members of his Committee, three-fourths of whom are dry, a legal but most unusual procedure. He proposed starting the hearing without any understanding with the members of the Committee as to the scope of the testimony or procedure, to which members of the Committee objected. In his opening statement, he denounced prohibition in strongest terms, as wrong in principle and a failure in practice and called upon all, except the fanatic, who it is assumed is the person who believes in national prohibition, to reason together "to relieve our country through reason and by conceiving a new system—one not founded on the bludgeon and a violation of man's conscientious convictions regarding drink." A more unjudicial statement one can scarcely conceive to come from the chairman of a Judiciary Committee about to listen with supposedly open minds to testimony for and against the *Eighteenth Amendment.* Then as if to justify his arranging for the hearing without consulting the members of his Committee he stated that those opposed to prohibition had no open forum from which to present their views, that the churches and the public platform were closed to them and that he proposed to give them an open forum in this hearing. This rather pathetic admission showing the plight of the "Wets," the newspapers carefully deleted in their report of Mr. Graham's statement.

So this is what this hearing is—a chance for the "Wets" to get their propaganda before the country through the newspapers—by the grace of the chairman of the Committee. No one, not even the "Wets," expect anything more to come of the hearings than to give publicity to a few outstanding and desperate "Wets." Perhaps it is well that Mr. Graham has given them this opportunity—blowing off may prevent them from blowing up.

Seventh Day Adventist Zeal

Recently at Perkasie, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, there was a revelation of the consuming zeal of Seventh Day Adventists in their aggressive opposition to our civil Sabbath laws which, unfortunately, is not unusual.

The Town Council had passed an ordinance prohibiting the operation on the Lord's Day of any amusement for which an admission is charged and providing a minimum penalty of $25.00 and a maximum penalty of $100.00, for its violation. The Burgess vetoed the ordinance. Following this a meeting of the Council was called at which it was to be decided whether the Council would pass the ordinance over the veto. On this occasion according to the local newspapers, the assemblage which gathered in the Council chamber was given color by the presence of several pastors of the Seventh Day Adventist denomination and several distinguished leaders of the Religious Liberty Association (which is an organization under which Seventh Day Adventist leaders conceal their identity) with international reputation and experience and, in addition, by at least forty men and women of the faith.

The distinguished leaders of this faith, who on this occasion concentrated their fire against the members of the Town Council who voted for the enactment of the local ordinance prohibiting the commercializing of the Lord's Day, were Dr. Charles Longacre, head of the Religious Liberty Association of Washington, D. C.; Rev. A. J. Clark in charge of this Association's work in the Eastern states; Rev. S. C. Prout, who represents the Association in Pennsylvania, and the pastors of the Allentown and North Philadelphia Adventist churches. After these big guns of the Seventh Day Adventist churches had inveighed by the space of two hours or thereabouts against "legislation encroaching on the rights and liberties guaranteed by the Constitution," the Council passed the ordinance over the veto of the Burgess.

We congratulate the Council for withstanding the oratory of these distinguished Seventh Day Adventists and for their courage in meeting the Menlo Park situation by imposing a heavier penalty for commercializing the Lord's Day than the $4.00 provided by the state law. We are wondering whether these distinguished leaders paid their own railroad and hotel expenses or whether they were paid by the owner of Menlo Park.

The Proposal of the Capper-Robsion Bill

This bill (S. 1586 and H. R. 10) proposes:

I. To consolidate the thirty bureaus, commissions and agencies, now trying to function in the Federal Government, scattered throughout the several Departments, under a Department of Education.

II. To make the head of this Department a member of the President's cabinet.

III. To conduct research work in addition to what is already being done and give information and suggestions along ten lines of necessary education:

1. Rural education.
2. Elementary education.
3. Secondary education.
4. Higher education.
5. Professional education.
6. Physical education.
7. Special education for the mentally and physically handicapped.
8. The training of teachers.
9. Immigrant education.
10. Adult education.
11. Such other fields as Congress or the Secretary shall deem wise to enter.

IV. To establish a permanent Commission of Education to be made up of the 57 superintendents of the several states and possessions of the United States. This commission to meet once each year to carry on this work, as the present temporary commission appointed by Secretary Wilbur is doing.

USE TWO POST CARDS

1. Drop a one cent postal card to Senator Capper, ask him for a copy of the Bill and the Congressional addresses supporting it.

2. Send another card to the National Education Association, 1201, 16th Street, N W., Washington, D. C., asking for Dr. John McCracken's pamphlet, "Education has First Claim to the Next Cabinet Seat," and other pamphlets.

"Lest We Forget"

THOSE who are laboring overtime to discredit National Prohibition would have people believe that there is more intoxicating liquor consumed now than before prohibition, more drunkenness, more political corruption due to liquor, and that bootlegging and lawlessness now connected with illegal liquor selling are the outgrowth of prohibition. They count on the people forgetting, or not knowing, the conditions that obtained under the licensing and regulation of the liquor business. Below are a few facts in the light of which let people judge whether prohibition has been a **blessing** or **"a damnable affliction."**

PITTSBURGH—IN THE YEAR 1900

Back in the good old days when prohibition was unknown in Pittsburgh

2,300 Speakeasies Selling Liquor Every Day

Pittsburgh Officials Conniving with Bootleggers

The following editorial is from the November 15, 1900 issue of the "Pittsburgh Leader": See files of same, Vol. 57, No. 151, in Carnegie Library, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

"At the meeting of the retail liquor dealers yesterday the statement was made that there are in Allegheny County 2,300 unlicensed dealers who sell liquor, in violation of the law, every day in the year, Sundays and election days included.

"This is a decidedly startling assertion, for while it is notorious that speakeasies exist, and, are to some extent tolerated by the authorities, there has been no visible reason to suppose that illicit traffic was being conducted on so large a scale.

"The district attorney of the county and the public safety directors of the city ought to be heard from on this head. If the law is being violated so extensively as the licensed dealers claim, it is manifest that there must be a wholesale neglect of duty in official quarters."

1900—Licensed saloons operating in Pittsburgh and Allegheny County under Brooks High License Law 1,047

1900—Speakeasies operating in same area according to licensed liquor dealers' report 2,300

Total number licensed and unlicensed places selling intoxicating liquor 3,347

PITTSBURGH IN 1930

If Pre-prohibition Conditions Still Obtained

1900—Population of Allegheny County 775,058

1930—Population of Allegheny County (estimated) 1,500,000

In the last thirty years the population of Allegheny County has practically doubled. If Pittsburgh were today under the liquor conditions of 1900, as to licensed liquor selling and bootlegging, the figures would be as follows:

1930 Licensed saloons in Allegheny County 2,094

1930 Speakeasies in same area 4,600

Total licensed and unlicensed places 6,694

Less and Better Liquor?

With nearly seven thousand licensed and unlicensed places selling intoxicating liquor and competition keen, of course, less liquor would be sold than is now being sold under prohibition, and all liquor would be of high grade, none of the poisoned stuff we now have under prohibition which causes the drinker to commit inhuman crimes, or kills him, but the good, simon-pure liquor of the old license days which gave the drinker a keener appreciation of his obligations to his family, inspired a love for all things good and true and rarely made him drunk. Does any intelligent person think so?

No Political Corruption?

With 6,700 liquor dealers with fat pocketbooks, interested in getting into office in Pittsburgh and Allegheny County public officials who would have a blind eye to liquor law violations, elections would be free from liquor influence and corruption and city and county officials— our District Attorney, our Judges, our Mayor, our Public Safety Director, our Police force, our City Magistrates—in the year 1930 would be incorrupt and incorruptible by liquordom. There would be no grafting, no taking of bribes, no connivance between public officials and liquor dealers, no domination or corrupting of political leaders by liquor. Any bribery or corruption of public officials that may exist today is chargeable to prohibition. Does any rightminded person think so?

"Lest We Forget"

Distilleries in Western Pennsylvania—Before and After Prohibition

1919-1930

Licensed distilleries in Western Pennsylvania producing whisky and other liquor, July 1919, when war prohibition became effective 36

Licensed distilleries in Western Pennsylvania, 1930 (producing medicinal liquor 2

Decrease 34

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, these 36 distilleries produced, solely for beverage purposes, gallons of liquor 5,861,193

Distillery Bonded Warehouses for whiskey and other liquor in Western Pennsylvania, July 1919, when war prohibition became effective 36

Distillery Bonded Warehouses in Western Pennsylvania at the present time (medicinal liquor) 3

Decrease 33

"Let We Forget"

Breweries in Western Pennsylvania —Before and After Prohibition

1919-1930

Breweries in Western Pennsylvania on July 1, 1919, when war prohibition became effective and which were at that time producing high-test beer (figures as to output not available) 42

Permit breweries in Western Pennsylvania on January 31, 1930, producing cereal beverage (these breweries have permits to manufacture near-beer. While there is probably some leakage of high-test beer, the amount is but a drop in the bucket compared with the output of 42 breweries, operating at top speed, prior to prohibition) 12

Decrease 30

"Lest We Forget"

Saloons in Pittsburgh Under Prohibition

1928-1930

(Continued on page 8, col. 1)

Association Activities

Dr. Martin attended the Executive Committee meeting of The National Conference of Organizations Supporting the Eighteenth Amendment, in Washington, D. C., on February 11th and 12th, and was present with the other members of the Executive Committee at the opening of the "Wet" hearing before the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives on the forenoon of the twelfth.

After spending one month in Philadelphia during which twenty-seven meetings were held, Mrs. Shepard and Mrs. Pritchard left for Florida on February 6th by auto. They are now holding meetings in Florida where they will continue probably for about six weeks after which they expect to return north.

Arkansas Campaign

Since the first of January, Dr. Fleming has been in Arkansas speaking and helping to organize a campaign in that state for required daily Bible reading in all its public schools. An official invitation for our Association to send Dr. Fleming to assist in this campaign was given by the State Board of the W.C.T.U. of Arkansas. Dr. Fleming first met with the State Board of this organization. Following this in cooperation with these and other leaders he secured the cooperation of outstanding religious leaders of the state, of the editors of leading religious papers and apparently of leading secular papers of the state. The Ministerial Association of Little Rock, the capital of the state, unanimously endorsed the campaign and the bill which appears below. The Moral Culture League with headquarters at Little Rock, will back the campaign. Difficulties encountered in the organization of the campaign have been met and the campaign is now well under way with Dr. Fleming and others speaking in the state.

Petitions will be circulated throughout the state to secure the signatures of at least eight percent of the total number of votes cast for Governor in the last preceding election. If this number is secured four months before the general election next November the proposed legislation will go on the ballot and a majority vote will make it a law of the state.

The proposed law follows:

"Whereas, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that 'This is a Christian Nation' and that the Bible is not a sectarian book;

Whereas, the Bible was generally read in the public schools of this country until, in recent years without sanction of law, it was crowded out;

Whereas, 14 state supreme courts have held it proper to use the Bible in the public schools and it is now read daily by law in all the *public* schools of Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Idaho and many great cities, where live 37,000,000 people;

Whereas, the Constitution of Arkansas says, 'Religion, Morality and knowledge being essential to good government' and 'Intelligence and virtue being safeguards of liberty and the bulwark of a free and good government, and

Whereas, the Bible is the principal source of our civilization and the best book in the world on good citizenship and good government;

Therefore, be it enacted by the people of the state of Arkansas:

Section 1. That every teacher or other person in charge shall provide for the reverent daily reading of a portion of the English Bible without comment in every public tax-supported school up to and including every high school in the state in the presence of the pupils; and prayer may be offered or the Lord's prayer repeated; provided, that no pupil shall be required to take part, and that any pupil shall be excused from the room on written request of a parent or guardian.

Section 2. That every teacher or other person in charge of any public tax-supported school up to and including every high school in this state who shall wilfully violate the terms of this act, shall be subject to a fine of not more than $25 dollars for each offense and upon a second conviction, the position held by such teacher or other person shall automatically become vacant and any contract for the services of such teacher or other person shall become null and void.

Section 3. That all laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed and this act shall be in full force and effect on and after January 31, 1931."

Mrs. Shepard's Letter

The campaign in Philadelphia has aroused great enthusiasm and there is real heart interest among the Christian people to stop the Mormon missionaries from proselyting from Christian churches. I was a guest speaker at the Quarterly Conference of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Philadelphia Conference, and I learned of several homes that had been touched by this heathen propaganda. One dear mother told of her son who has accepted this faith, and he had formerly been president of an Epworth League. This young man heard the Mormons speak *on the streets in this city* and was won by their sly and subtle words. *Warning*: *Stop* their street meetings in *every city* by presenting to the mayor a copy of the "Mormon Oath of Disloyalty," found in the Senate Documents of 1906.

Interesting clippings have reached me from the Salt Lake Daily papers, telling in great headlines that "The seminaries of the Latter Day Saints Church in Utah have been put under observation."

Mr. I. L. Williamson, state high school inspector, has presented a special report to the state board of education. The report shows that there seems to be a close relationship between the high schools and the Mormon seminaries; that children are excused to go from their public school work into the seminaries for instruction on the "Book of Mormon" and history of the Mormon Church.

The analysis shows that in close proximity to 80 percent of the high schools, the Mormon Church has built seminary buildings for the inculcating of the Mormon religion. The question has been made, "Should the public educational system *grant credits* for religious instruction given in denominational schools?" It has been a fundamental principle in America and *Utah* that church and state should be entirely divorced. This has not been observed by the Mormon Church, for in these high schools it is found that credits are given for Old Testament, New Testament, (Mormon Bible), *Religion* and *Theology*. The basic aims in the teaching of Mormon theology are an abiding testimony, "That God is our Father; that Jesus is the Christ and that *Joseph Smith and his successors are the prophets chosen by God to establish His gospel on the earth as the power of God unto salvation.*"

The first year in their high school work requires a study in the Old Testament and the reading of the Book of Esther from the Book of Mormon. The second year, a study of the New Testament and the Book of Nephi from the Mormon Bible—and so it goes on through all the Mormon teachings. A casual glance at note books and examination papers revealed some very queer teachings which would be accepted by no other denomination. First, that the Garden of Eden was located in Jackson County, Missouri. Second, that Noah's ark was built and launched in America. Third, that Joseph

Smith's version of the Bible is superior to the King James version. I doubt if there is another state in the Union where any other denomination would have the power to unite its church schools with its high schools in a relationship so intimate that *their seminaries and high schools are generally thought of as one institution.* Yet this is the custom in Utah and would become the custom all over our land if the Mormons had the power.

A committee of prominent educators has been appointed to look into: first, the financial and economic aspects; second, the educational aspect; third, the statutory and constitutional aspect. We will await with interest the report of this committee.

Letters from friends in Utah have brought some rather interesting facts which you, my dear reader, will be glad to know. Salt Lake papers have been running great headlines about the number of appointments to federal positions given to that state. Headlines read, *"Utah leads all other states in its proportion of federal jobs. Influence of Senator Smoot brings many high-salaried positions to native section."* Each state is entitled to its quota of such offices, and in that respect all states are on a parity. It is only in the field-at-large where *senatorial influence determines* the amount of patronage accorded a state that Utah stands forth. In proportion to population, *Utah has no equal.* It is given, on good authority, that the Mormons in the United States Departments in Washington now number fully five thousand. This brings in a large revenue to the Mormon Church.

Another friend writes, "We would all rest easier on our pillows if we knew you were safe from the Mormons. You are on the hearts and minds of some of us all the time, and it seems that the Mormons are going on in the same old way only more sly and a little wiser. Did I say sly? Yes, sly in some ways but more bold, too. Do they live in polygamy? Do THEY? Here is a clipping that sounds *queer* if they do not." My friend enclosed the clipping which told of the death of a prominent Mormon, President of a *"Stake"* and the last line reads, "Surviving him are his two wives and thirteen sons and daughters."

And from a missionary friend who has spent thirty years in Utah, was an enclosed clipping telling of the golden wedding of one of Brigham Young's daughters, and my friend writes that this woman went through Utah talking to the young women of the Mormon Church and saying, "Girls, don't forget polygamy; you cannot practice it now, but keep it alive in your hearts. Remember there are four girls for every boy in Utah, and polygamy will yet be allowed not only in this state but all over the United States and Europe."

This letter closes with, "Remember my prayers are always with you that you may have daily grace and strength; and that the Lord may use you mightily in this part of his cause." *Will you, my friends,* voice this same prayer for this work during this month."

Objections to the Department of Education

THERE are no valid objections to the establishment of this Department. There are several fanciful ones advanced by its antagonists. The First is that "It is unnecessary." This is Secretary Wilbur's objection. To which it has been replied, the illiteracy in the United States, the backward condition of the education in isolated localities, and among exceptional populations, the lack of comprehensive knowledge of what should be done, and the scattered, inefficient way in which the thirty disjointed agencies of the Federal government have been trying to do this work is sufficient answer as to its necessity. *The Second* is that "Education is a State matter." The answer is that the government has already thirty agencies at it and no state today, under the migratory habits of the people, can retain the consequences of its own neglect of education; and no state will undertake research work on a national scale.

Third, "It would mean Federal Control of Education." This bill makes no provision for any sort of Federal control.

Fourth, "It would tend to standardize our education." It would probably improve all of our schools but leave them free to develop according to their own ideals.

Fifth, "It would interfere with private schools." No. It would help them by placing the facts and conditions of education at their disposal as they could have them from no other source.

Sixth, "It would bring schools into politics." How? There is nothing in this bill that even squints in this direction any more than the present Bureau of Education does.

Seventh, "It would tend to decrease local effort and increase the tendency of the people to rely on the government." They could rely on the government only for exact and ample knowledge of what is needed and how to do it. This is all that is provided for in this bill.

Eighth, "It would do nothing that the present Bureau of Education cannot do." Only the work of the other twenty-nine scattered agencies and it could do it in an efficient way and eliminate the waste and inefficiency of present methods. The cause of education should not be compelled in this age of automobiles and air planes to plug along in an ox cart. It needs a new model.

We have never studied an opposition to any advanced step in governmental organization that had so little to stand on as the opposition to this new Department.

Who is Supporting the Proposed New Department?

Thirty-two National Welfare Organizations are back of this movement. These include the National Education Association, the American Federation of Labor, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the General Federation of Woman's Clubs, the National Council of Jewish Women, the Federal Council of Churches, the National Association of Negro Women.

In fact the only organization of which we have knowledge, opposing it, is the Roman Catholic Church and this opposition originates outside of the United States.

But the active support of the independent voter is demanded to finally carry this measure and we appeal to them to throw in their influence at this time.

There are 496 men in the United States with incomes of a million or more. How many are crowding close to the million mark we do not know. There are probably about 2,000,000 unemployed workers in the country today. In our judgment it is the economies practiced to swell these incomes that laid off the men and so grinds the face of the poor to swell the incomes. Were three-fourths of these 496 incomes distributed in additional wages, it would so stimulate the buying power of the workers that there would be no slack time, and poor millionaires would probably be able to keep out of the poor house.

"Lest We Forget"

(Continued from Page 5)

1928-1930—Licensed Saloons .. 0
1928—Unlicensed Saloons (Pre-prohibition Saloons) operating 522
1930—Unlicensed Saloons (Pre-prohibition Saloons) operating 3

With most of Pittsburgh's officials shamelessly recreant to their sworn duty to enforce the prohibition law against pre-prohibition saloons still operating, the Federal Prohibition office at Pittsburgh, in March, 1928, began an aggressive campaign to put these saloons out of business which has been carried on successfully to date.

Survey

A survey of the 30 wards of Pittsburgh completed March 22, 1928, under the direction of Commander John D. Pennington, Federal Prohibition Commissioner, revealed the fact that 522 pre-prohibition saloons were selling intoxicating liquor. A survey completed January 1, 1930 showed that this number had been reduced to 3.

The majority of the 519 missing saloons have been padlocked by injunction proceedings and are now padlocked or have been remodeled and are operating in a legitimate way as restaurants, barber shops, garages, etc.

The Federal Prohibition officials with little assistance from the municipal officers of Pittsburgh have been able to accomplish these results. If the latter would respect their oath of office and make a sincere and reasonable effort to enforce the law, conditions, now greatly improved over those under the licensed saloons, would be very much better.

"Lest We Forget"

Prohibition's Effect on Poor Homes

It was in the homes of the poor that liquor used to work its greatest havoc. Is it working havoc in these poor homes today, under National Prohibition, to the extent that it did in former days when the liquor traffic was licensed and regulated?

Here is the testimony of a **Pittsburgher who knows**, on this subject: **H. W. Shepard, General Manager of the Pittsburgh Association for the Improvement of the poor says:**

About Drunkenness

"Though caring for more than five hundred men each night during the year 1929, the number of drunken men we have to contend with is so small as compared with the number we had in former years, that it is hardly worthy of notice."

About Relief Work

"In our Family Relief Work we look after and provide for thousands of families each year, and these cases are all thoroughly investigated by our Visiting staff. **Very, very few of these families are in destitute circumstances because of intoxicating liquor.** In most cases the need exists because the husband is either dead or sick, or temporarily out of employment. Comparatively few homes are neglected today through drink, as they were years ago."

"Lest We Forget"

Copies of this article, in leaflet form, are available at these headquarters, for $1.00 per 100.

Dogberry Police

Faneuil Hall has listened to many pleas for many kinds of liberty and license since it first was named the Cradle of Liberty. But the silliest, most insane and contemptible plea that ever echoed from its halls was that of Julian Codmon and his beer cohorts when they passed resolutions condemning the Coast Guard for firing on a smuggler's boat that refused to stop on signal and petitioning President Hoover to restrain them. By that resolution this bunch of slaves of Gambrinus asked the President to turn this old historic force into a sort of Dogberry Police. Here is their ideal from Shakespeare.

Dogberry. This is your charge: You shall comprehend all vagrom men; you are to bid any man stand, in the prince's name.

Watch. How if a' will not stand?

Dogberry. Why, then, take no note of him, but let him go, and presently call the rest of the watch together and thank God you are rid of a knave.

Watch. If we know him to be a thief, shall we not lay hands on him?

Dogberry. Truly, by your office, you may; truly, I would not hang a dog by my will, much more a man who hath any honesty in him.

Would not this honored American Force, the Coast Guard, cut a figure under such instruction? Yet this is the attitude that these beer-obsessed, un-American, haters of the constitution would have the President take.

But this is not the worst feature of this pusillanimous plea. The rankest insult lies in their comparison of the orderly resistance of the Boston Tea Party to the illegal, unconstitutional acts of George III, with the lawlessness of the present day rum-runner, or even worse the comparison of the orderly process by which the American people amended their constitution and laws with the usurpations which brought on the Revolution.

Their plea for the protection of smugglers is as infamous as the plea of Attorney General Austin, delivered in that same Cradle of Liberty, for approbation of the murder of Lovejoy. But where was the Boston citizen today who stood up like Wendell Phillips and cried "Shame. Is this Faneuil Hall doctrine?" He seems to have been conspicuous by his absence. Has Boston become a cross section of peasant Europe?

Fortunately for the United States the Coast Guard is not commanded by men of that ilk. Codmon et cetera will find little response in American circles to his crocodile tears. When the Coast Guard signals, Stop! That is the voice of the American people speaking. Let them stop or take the consequence. We want our shores protected by no Dogberry Police.

We Agree

Samuel Harding Church has broken loose again. This time he advocates the formation of a "wet," or "liberal" party, to combat prohibition. He says that it must be entirely free from church domination, but did not tell us how he proposed to keep out the wet influence of the Roman Catholic church or to shed the slush funds of the six wine growing nations that are out to make the world safe for booze.

Go to it Prexy. But what the students of Carnegie Tech did to you four years ago is not a circumstance to what the voters of the United States will do to your party when you try to get it going.

An Evil Tradition

The Bishop of Winchester recently wrote," "The evil tradition not yet abandoned, that Christianity has nothing to do with politics and economics, has banished God from ninety-five per cent of man's life."

Whether his percentage is correct, we believe this evil tradition is responsible for the attempt to banish the Bible from the curriculum of the public schools.